



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CORRESPONDENCE.

A LANGUAGE OF THE PHILIPPINES.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS :—On January 26, 1907, Dr. Charles Wilhelm Seidenadel of Chicago presented to the Philological Society of the University of Chicago selected chapters of his manuscript *First Grammar of The Bontoc Igorot*. The author, who is a trained philologist and a thorough musician, associated last summer for several months with the members of a group of the Igorot tribe, about thirty in number, brought to Chicago at the close of the St. Louis Exposition and exhibited at River View Park. Continuous intercourse with these people, often lasting ten hours each day, enabled Mr. Seidenadel not only to understand their language, but also to converse with them freely in it upon a basis of mutual intelligibility. He was successful in transcribing between three and four thousand complete sentences, which he first repeatedly tested in actual use and then subjected to critical examination and classification for the purpose of the Grammar.

The linguistic and ethnological importance of a study like that here mentioned is clear in the light of our close national relations with the Philippine Islands and of the almost utter lack of trustworthy philological work in the languages of the archipelago. Mr. Seidenadel's remarkable initial success, his singular natural gift and special training for making accurate phonetic transcriptions of the spoken word, and his personal friendly relations with a considerable group of the natives prominent in the Igorot tribe, are, it seems to the members of the Philological Society, strong reasons for expecting from Mr. Seidenadel's further research in this direction results of very great importance for the linguistic and ethnological history of the Islands.

Mr. Seidenadel hopes to secure from some source the means needed for residence in the Philippines to complete his studies of the Bontoc Igorot and to extend his attention to other allied dialects.

STARR WILLARD CUTTING,
Secretary of the Philological Society.

The University of Chicago.

THE ETYMOLOGY OF *bore*.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS :—The *Oxford Dictionary* rejects the usual explanation of the verb *bore*, 'to weary,' as a figurative use of *bore*, 'to pierce,' holding that

the noun *bore* in the sense of 'the malady of ennui' (1766) is the source of the other senses, and of the verb itself. An interesting passage from a letter of Lady Sarah Lennox, January 9, 1766 (*Life and Letters*, 1902, I, 179), is worth adding to the quotations given by Dr. Murray, and may perhaps be thought to supply evidence for the priority of the noun :

"I have given you a pretty good boar upon dress . . . I told you the word 'boar' is a fashionable expression for tiresome people & conversations, & is a very good one & very useful, for one may tell anybody (Ld G. Cavendish for example), 'I am sure this will be a boar, so I must leave you, Ld George.' If it was not the fashion it would be very rude, but I own I encourage the fashion vastly, for it's delightful I think ; one need only name a pig or pork, & nobody dares take it ill but hold their tongues directly."

Yet after all it seems more probable that the current etymology is correct. The verb in the sense of 'to weary by tedious conversation' is quoted from 1768, and may well have been in use a few years earlier. *To bore one's ears* in the sense of 'to force one to listen' is duly registered by Dr. Murray, with three quotations, the latest from 1642, and he adds a cross-reference to the verb *bore* 'to weary.' The following additional quotations (especially the second) conduct one easily enough to the latter verb, for it is not difficult to pass from 'to bore a person's ears with offensive or tedious conversation' to the simpler 'to bore a person.' Such ellipses are common enough.

1665. *The English Rogue* (I, 242 of the reprint): "His prophane and irreligious discourse did so bore my glowing ears, that . . . I could not endure to hear him blaspheme."

1699. *The Country Gentleman's Vade Mecum*, p. 4 : "If you'll come here you must sometimes expect to be encountered with the Apes and Peacocks of the Town, those useless Creatures that we dignifie and distinguish by the modish Titles of *Fops* and *Beaux*, and what's worse, be compelled to suffer your Ears to be bor'd through and grated with an empty, tedious Din of their dull Impertinencies, or else the squeamish Cox[c]ombs look awry and scornfully upon you, and immediately repute you to be a *proud, ill-natur'd, unmannerly Country Fellow*."

There is surely no difficulty in getting from the verb *bore* in the figurative sense of 'to weary' to the noun *bore* 'ennui.' As for the adjective *French* in *French bore* (1768),—which Dr. Murray says "naturally suggests that the word is of French origin" and which leads him to hazard the conjecture *bourre*, 'padding,' 'triviality,'—

there is surely no difficulty about it. Instead of indicating a French origin for the *word*, it doubtless indicates a French origin for the *state of mind*. Indeed Dr. Murray himself remarks that the "malady of ennui" was "supposed to be specially 'French.'"

G. L. KITTREDGE.

Harvard University.

Beowulf, 62.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—Having been forced to protest against the charge of "questionable tactics" preferred against me in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxii, 96, I ask your indulgence for handing to you the following brief and final reply in this matter.

1. It is entirely unfair to say that I have "persisted in seeing things in the autotype that surely are not there." I never dreamed of claiming or insinuating that I could see a trace of a *þ* or *a* or *w* or *æ*. I am neither prepared to say what the erased letters were nor what they were not—excepting the *s* which I am quite willing to believe Professor Bryant has successfully rescued. If Professor Bryant has information about the other letters, it is to be regretted that he has not divulged it. I merely cited, by way of concrete illustration, what seems to me a possible case, stating at the same time distinctly that "the nature of the word or words erased as well as the reading of the scribe's original ms. is entirely a matter of speculation." If I am hopelessly unable to grasp Professor Bryant's position, he fails in no less degree to understand my point of view.

2. The reading "*hyrde ic* in *Fat. Ap.* 70," in my letter, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxi, 256^b, l. 1 f. is a regrettable, but not unnatural slip of the pen (possibly a typographical error), which is in a measure counterbalanced by the occurrence, in l. 10, of the correct form: "*hyrde we* 70." Professor Bryant does not mention the latter quotation, but makes much of the "misquotation." I had not noticed the slip until it was brought home to me in a manner not altogether pleasant. A hand-written duplicate (which I have saved) of the copy sent to the Editors shows the proper plural form *we*.

3. The charge that "the first time [I] referred to the passage [I] gave the wrong line-number" is an interesting puzzle to me. To the very best of my recollection, I never referred to the *Fat. Ap.* passage except in that much abused letter (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxi, 256^b). The only explanation I can guess of this terrible charge is that Professor Bryant had in mind somebody else, namely Dr. Schücking, who, on p. 85 of his *Satzverknüpfung*, misprints: "*Hyrde we, þæt Jacob . . . V. 20*" (instead of 70). But I most certainly beg to be excused from acting the part of a scapegoat.

FR. KLAEBER.

The University of Minnesota.

ERRATA.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—Permit me to say that in my article printed in last December's issue of this journal there are some errata which I wish to correct. They are as follows:

- P. 236a, line 21. *yrub* instead of *yrnþ*.
 line 28. *winierdas* instead of *winierdes*.
 P. 236b, line 26. *sapinus* instead of *supinus*.
 P. 237a, line 33. *Ledern* instead of *Leder*.
 line 37 and 44. *Kunne* instead of *kunne*.
 line 48. *Not* instead of *Note*.
 P. 237b, line 40. *HH* instead of *Hpt*.

I take this opportunity to draw attention to the fact that in his *Contributions to Old English Lexicography*, London, 1906, pp. 6-7, Napier, at Prof. Toller's suggestion, prints as proof for *ars-gang* (*latrina*) the same passages from the *Leechdoms* I had quoted to contradict him. He reinforces them by one from his forthcoming edition of *St. Chrodegang's Rule*, p. 113, where we read *þæt meox his argances*. He now admits the word with the seemingly well-authenticated by-form *argang* as genuine. As to the latter, I beg to refer to my remarks in the forthcoming number of *Anglia*. Concerning *heorþa* (*nebris*) quoted by me, on page 237a, it should be noted that Sweet fails to record it, though Hall and B.-T. have it, as Napier l. c. p. 37 points out, quoting from *St. Chrodegang's Rule*, p. 74, *biccene* = *byccene heorðan* (*pelles buccinas* = *hircinas*). The word has been identified with OHG. *herdo* (*velus*) by Zupitza, *Die Germ. Gutturale*, p. 111. With regard to *thwacch*, erroneously attributed to Epinal by Sievers, *Ag. Gr.*³, § 222, note 4, observe that the error reappears in Bülbring's *Elementarbuch*, § 133, note and § 528, note 1. With regard to Sievers' statement in § 249, note 2, to the effect that an ancient dat. pl. of *smeoru* is recorded which lacks *-w*, *smerum*, I would ask: Is this not the *smerum* of Lr. 35 (*buccis*) which Sweet, *OET*, p. 529^a, erroneously connects with *smeoru*? Napier, note to *OEGl.* 1, 697, points out the mistake. Finally, I wish to draw attention to two or three words from the oldest Glossaries which, as far as I see, are recorded by neither Hall and Sweet nor Bosworth-Toller: (1) *asēodan* (*expendere*); on record in the *Corpus Glossary*, ed. Hessels E 542 = Sweet Cp 815, from *Oros.* i, 10¹⁸; (2) *æmonnis* (*excidium*) *ibid.* E 526, absent from Sweet; (3) *bebītan* (*mordicus conrodere*); on record in *EfEf.* 1319 = Cp 616. The reference is to *Oros.* v, 12². *Asēodan* is, of course, a derivative of *sēod* (*marzuppium*).

OTTO B. SCHLUTTER.